



REMARKS

Claims 1-34 are pending in the application. In light of the following remarks, Applicant believes all the pending claims are now in condition for allowance.

The § 103(a) Rejection of Claims 1-8, 10-15, 22-28, and 30-34

Claims 1-8, 10-15, 22-28, and 30-34 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over European Application No. 869,433 by Anodide in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,097,388, issued August 1, 2000 to Goodfellow. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Initially, the Office Action admits that Anodide does not teach identifying a first set of windows that are active on the desktop of a computer; identifying a second set of windows that are active on the desktop of the computer; and comparing the first set of windows to the second set of windows to identify a new window in the second set. Nevertheless, the Office Action asserts that Goodfellow remedies the deficiencies of the primary reference Anodide.

Anodide is directed to techniques that more efficiently manage the way picture elements of windows are updated. In order to accomplish this, Anodide describes numerous data structures including window descriptor array 34, window descriptor structures 42, cover collection 36, old display map 38, and new display map 40 (see FIG. 4). The Office Action alleges that the display maps in Anodide are equivalent to the claimed sets of windows. Assuming this is correct, Goodfellow has not been shown to teach the following feature:

comparing the first set of windows to the second set of windows to
identify a new window in the second set;

Goodfellow does not compare the old display map and the new display map to identify a new window. Instead, when a new window is generated, Goodfellow teaches that a new window descriptor structure 42 is created and the new window is inserted in a linked list of windows (col. 6, lines 45-50). In other words, once a new window is generated, Goodfellow teaches modifying data structures to account for the new window. Thus, the display maps are not utilized to identify a new window as asserted.

Contrariwise, the display maps in Goodfellow are utilized to identify picture elements that have changed. The various data structures are utilized to update the new display map (see FIGS. 8a-8d). The old and new display maps are then compared to identify picture elements whose topmost window has changed (see col. 2, lines 37-42 and FIGS. 10a-10b). Goodfellow

describes that identifying the picture elements that have changed can result in a more efficient update of the raster display. However, the comparison of the display maps is not for the purpose of identifying a new window as claimed.

As the references, even if combined, have not been shown to disclose all the features of the claims, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established. Accordingly, claims 1-8, 10-15, 22-28, and 30-34 should be passed to issue.

The § 103(a) Rejection of Claims 9 and 29

Claims 9 and 29 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Anodide in view of Goodfellow and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,144,962, issued November 7, 2000 to Weinberg et al. (hereinafter "Weinberg"). Claim 9 and 29 are dependent claims and it has not been shown where Weinberg remedies the deficiencies of the other two references Anodide and Goodfellow as described above. Accordingly, these claims are patentably distinct for at least the same reasons.

The § 103(a) Rejection of Claim 16

Claim 16 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Anodide in view of Goodfellow and further in view the state of the art. Although the Office Action asserts that dependent claim 16 includes conventional storage media, it has not been shown that the state of the art remedies the deficiencies of the other two references Anodide and Goodfellow as described above. Accordingly, claim 16 is patentably distinct for at least the same reasons.

The § 103(a) Rejection of Claims 17-21

Claims 17-21 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Anodide in view of Goodfellow and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,189,116, issued February 13, 2001 to Mongan et al. (hereinafter "Mongan"). These references, even if combined, have not been shown to support a prima facie case of obviousness.

Initially, the Office Action asserts that Anodide and Goodfellow can be combined as described above to produce "an application mapper that programmatically executes an application to generate a map of the graphical user interface of the application" as recited in

claim 17. However, Anodide describes that in order to inform the test software about the windows of an application, the tester manually opens and closes each window. For example, Anodide states as follows:

The tester "informs" TDE what the windows of the application are, by sequentially opening and closing each one.

(col. 8, lines 6-8). After being informed of the windows in this manner, Anodide discusses creating an object forest and opens relation (see, e.g., col. 8, lines 48-56). Thus, Anodide discusses that the tester manually opens and closes windows to inform the test software about the GUI windows.


Goodfellow is cited as showing that data structures regarding windows can be maintained in order to more efficiently display picture elements of windows that change on a display. It has not been shown how these references, even if combined, would disclose the application mapper as claimed. Although Mongan is also cited, it has not been shown that this reference, even if combined, remedies the deficiencies of the other two references.

As it has been shown that the three references, even if combined, disclose or suggest all the features of claims 17-21, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established and the claims should be passed to issue.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant believes all the pending claims are in condition for allowance and should be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would in any way expedite the prosecution of the application, please do not hesitate to call the undersigned at (408) 446-8693.

Respectfully submitted,


Michael J. Ritter
Reg. No. 36,653

RITTER, LANG & KAPLAN LLP
12930 Saratoga Ave., Suite D1
Saratoga, CA 95070
Tel: 408-446-8690
Fax: 408-446-8691